

1 **REMARKS**

2 Amendments to the Claims:

3 Claims 12-18 have been canceled without prejudice because those claims
4 stand withdrawn as of the final action.

5 Claim 19 has been amended by deleting terminology in the third line of that
6 claim and by adding a phrase after the ninth line of that claim.

7 Claim 22 has been amended by changing a term in that claim so as to be
8 consistent with the amendments to claim 19.

9 Claim 27 has been amended by deleting terminology in the third line of that
10 claim and by adding a phrase after the eighth line of that claim.

11 Claim 30 has been amended by changing a term in that claim so as to be
12 consistent with the amendments to claim 27.

13 The amendments to the claims are supported at least by figures 3 and 4 of
14 the drawings, and the written description at page 9, line 28 through page 10, line 19,
15 and at page 12, lines 8-32, and at page 25, line 26 through page 26, line 22. No new
16 matter has been added to the claims by way of amendments.

17 Objection to Claims Under 37 CFR 1.75:

18 Claims 27-34 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being substantial
19 duplicates of claims 19-26, respectively.

20 The Applicant has amended claims 19 and 27 as indicated hereinabove. The
21 Applicant believes those amendments to claims 19 and 27 are sufficient to overcome
22 the objection to claims 27-34 because those claims as amended are not substantial
23 duplicates of claims 19-26, respectively.

24 Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

25 Claims 19-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,134,568 to Tonkin in view of EP 0621563 A1 ("EP").

The Applicant notes that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 requires that the
prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.
(MPEP 706.02(j).)

1 The Applicant contends that claims 19-34, as amended, are nonobvious
2 because Tonkin and EP, when combined, do not teach or suggest all the claim
3 limitations as is required for an obviousness rejection.

4 In regard to claim 19, that claim has been amended to now contain at least
5 the following limitations:

6 *obtaining an electronic image, comprising:*

7 *selected data retrieved from a database, the selected data*
8 *corresponding to the client selection; and,*

9 *a postage marking calculated based on a total weight of a booklet;*

10 *and,*

11 *printing the electronic image onto one or more sheets of print media.*

12 In regard to claim 27, that claim has been amended to now contain at least
13 the following limitations:

14 *accessing a read only memory device and retrieving selected data*
15 *corresponding to the client selection;*

16 *obtaining an electronic image comprising:*

17 *the selected data; and,*

18 *a postage marking calculated based on a total weight of a booklet;*

19 *and,*

20 *printing the electronic image onto one or more sheets of print media.*

21 The Applicant has searched both Tonkin and EP and does not find that those
22 references when combined teach or suggest all the limitations now required by
23 claims 19 and 27, respectively. Furthermore, the Applicant notes that the Examiner
24 makes no assertion that Tonkin and EP when combined teach or suggest all the
25 limitations now required by claims 19 and 27, respectively.

26 The Applicant therefore contends that claims 19 and 27 are nonobvious in
27 view of Tonkin and EP because those references when combined do not teach or
28 suggest all the limitations now required by claims 19 and 27, respectively, as
29 required for an obviousness rejection.

30 In regard to claims 20-26 and claims 28-34, those claims depend from claim
31 19 and claim 27, respectively. Therefore, each of claims 20-26 contains all of the

1 limitations of claim 19, and each of claims 28-34 contains all of the limitations of
2 claim 27. Accordingly, each of claims 20-26 and 28-34 is nonobvious at least for the
3 reasons set forth above with respect to claims 19 and 27.

4 Withdrawal of Final Rejections:

5 The Applicant respectfully contends that the amendments to the claims as
6 indicated hereinabove are in compliance with the requirements of a showing under
7 37 CFR 1.116(b) because those amendments require only a cursory review by the
8 Examiner. Furthermore, the Applicants contend that the amendments to the claims
9 place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully
10 request that the amendments be entered, and that the final rejections of claims
11 19-34 be withdrawn, and that those claims be allowed.

12 **SUMMARY**

13 The Applicant believes that this communication is fully responsive to the final
14 action mailed 05/19/2005. The Applicant requests timely allowance of claims 19-34.

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 Carl S. CHOW

17 Date: July 12, 2005

18 By: 

19 Thomas A. Olson
20 Attorney and agent for Applicant
21 Reg. No. 44,271
22 Phone: (509) 327-4748
23
24
25